DS
120
.S3

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
Chap. IS 180 Copyright No.
Shelf .S3
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

CAN JEWS BE PATRIOTS?

An Historical Study

BY

REV. DR. ISAAC SCHWAB,

(339 East 52d Street, New York.)

PRICE, 25 CENTS.

NEW YORK:
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL OF THE HEBREW ORPHAN ASYLUM,
76TH STREET, BETWEEN THIRD AND LEXINGTON AVENUES.
1878.

CAN JEWS BE PATRIOTS?

An Historical Study

BY

REV. DR. ISAAC SCHWAB,

(339 East 52d Street, New York.)

NEW YORK:
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL OF THE HEBREW ORPHAN ASYLUM,
76TH STREET, BETWEEN THIRD AND LEXINGTON AVENUES.
1878.

DS120
.S3

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1878,
By Rev. Dr. ISAAC SCHWAB,
in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

CAN JEWS BE PATRIOTS?

Are the Jews able to love and cling to the country of their birth or adoption?

Professor Goldwin Smith, of England, denies it It was during England's political complications with Russia that he, in an article entitled: "England's Abandonment of the Protectorate of Turkey," expressed himself: "They have now been everywhere made voters; to make them patriots while they remain genuine Jews, is beyond the legislator's power." In another paper he plainly charges the English Jews with using their influence towards drawing England into a war, and asks that, in the presence of such political danger, the exercise of political power be watched rather closely. He pretends also to know that the ruling motives of the Jewish community are not exclusively those which actuate a patriotic Englishman, but are specially Jewish and plutopolitan.

The Jews are to him a "jealously separate race," Judaism is a "distinction of race,"[1] and an English Jew is not an "Englishman holding particular theological tenets, he is a Jew with a special deity for his own race."[2] Consequently, he argues, the English Jews cannot love their country and bear allegiance to it. He demands that they "cease their clinging to this miserable idolatry of race, which has in the

[1] Rev. Robert Hall gives us credit for being the "depositaries of true religion."

[2] James Anthony Froude has it, that among the ancient Hebrews God was the supreme Lord of the world. Did we degenerate since from this faith?

present actually lost its character," and then they could be regarded as loyal citizens and patriots. What in his opinion disables them most from becoming such, is their refusal of intermarriage, for, says he, "It would be difficult to name anything more distinctive of those relations with the rest of the community on which patriotism depends, than the refusal of intermarriage. Mere soil is not the country, but the soil inhabited by the race, the race which is in every sense ours, and to which we are proud and happy to belong." He would not let them pass as full citizens, unless they submit to intermarriage, though he is generous enough not to wish them deprived of their emancipation, should they even conclude to remain "genuine, strict" Jews. It is only this class of Jews to whom he would deny the possibility of being patriots, while to the rest, the liberal who are on a level with the theists, stripped of every Jewish peculiarity, he concedes the right to that name.

Such extravagant reasoning is Professor Smith's! Dr. Hermann Adler, of London, ably refuted some of his arguments in the April number of the *Nineteenth Century*, leaving, however, ample scope for others to take up the same task. I, for my part, shall also review the Professor's assertions, in the following pages.

Let me, at the outset, ask in the name of common sense: Would an English Jew, if England were threatened with immediate danger, fail to stand up resolutely with his Christian compatriots to defend her, because he keeps the Sabbath and not the Sunday? Would he refuse to offer his money or his strength on the altar of patriotism, because he has never been baptized? Does the Jewish religion forbid patriotic sentiments and actions? I defy any one to prove it from the Bible or the Talmud. Professor Smith could, after some inquiry, have found just the contrary statement in a Catechism

for the Jewish youth of England, written by Ascher, which I presume is yet in use there. In that book we find the following.

"Has the Jew a fatherland besides Jerusalem?

"Yes, the country wherein he is bred and born, and in which he has the liberty to practise his religion, and where he is allowed to carry on traffic and trade, and to enjoy all the advantages and protection of the law, in common with the citizens of other creeds, this country the Israelite is bound to acknowledge as his fatherland, to the benefit of which he must do his best to contribute. The sovereign who rules over this land is (after God) his sovereign; its laws, so long as they are not contradictory to the Divine Law, are also the Israelite's laws; and the duties of his fellow-citizens are also his duties."

This catechism was written by a "strict" Jew, as the orthodox turn of the quoted question indicates, and for the "genuine" Jewish youth. From it they are assuredly taught to love their country. Since, then, the Sabbath-school does not foster notions of unpatriotic separatism, where else does the English youth gather them? At home, perhaps, in their intercourse with their parents? I need not hesitate solemnly to declare, in the name of all Jewish parents of England, may they be ever so "genuine and strict," that they would reject the idea of teaching their children that they are not by their religion and conscience bound to love and abide by their country.

What is one's country? Certainly not the mere soil, as Professor Smith himself truly says, and as everybody will admit. Not the soil, nor the climate or latitude, where a certain number of men settle together, makes this habitation their country, but their society organized on the basis of right, justice, and humanity. - The confederation of all those

inhabitants by the ties of common laws and human rights makes their surroundings their country, may they differ ever so widely from one another in their religious persuasions. Where the law of the commonwealth protects their interests, and permits them to enjoy life unmarred by illegal encroachments, they, in turn, will be its true friends, whether they be Christians, Jews, or Mohammedans. Nor should the national descent, foreign or native, or the relations of race and the peculiar complexion, be made a test of one's attachment to his country. For, as the wise Nathan rejoins to the bigot Templar, "we have not ourselves made choice of our race." And the foreigner having settled in that land permanently, and interwoven his interests with those of the native citizens, will just as heartily be devoted to it as they, provided he have equal rights and liberties, untainted by sectarian prejudices, or the fanaticism of race. He will be devoted to it both as a matter of course and of necessity; that is, from gratitude for the protection enjoyed, as well as from the latent motive of self-interest. And, I think, the assertion can easily be sustained, that this motive is not altogether foreign to thousands of non-Jews glorying in their patriotism. They are necessarily concerned in the welfare and safety of their country. When it is imperilled, their own interests are so also, and therefore they watch jealously over their territory, securing it from the invasion of foreigners, who would injure their property, and use all sorts of violence against them. Common patriotism is not so much ardent affection for the general good, as implicit or disguised love for one's own fireside.

But, agreeing that all patriotism springs from pure sentiments of gratitude and disinterested attachment to one's country, is the Jew incapable of such virtues? As little as he is incapable of tender love to his parents. He will very

rarely be found lacking in this supreme virtue. It is infused into his mind from his early childhood as the most sacred obligation. We may then safely conclude that, if one is tenderly attached to his parents for being his kindest benefactors, he will bear a similar love to his country, if it also prove a true benefactor to him.

He cannot be expected, however, to love it more than his parents, to demand which, as Cicero did in his treatise upon duties, would be quite unnatural. He says: "Dear are the parents, the children, the relatives and friends, yet the endearments of all these are comprised in the one common country, for which no good man will hesitate to give up his life, could he serve and benefit it thereby." Such a doctrine was fit to be preached in Rome, to a martial nation, given to the vainglory of subduing all the rest of the world to their iron rule. It is yet preached by the mercenaries of despotic governments, to inflame the passions of the masses for a war of invasion or revenge upon another nation. Judaism never made such an extreme demand upon the human heart as to hold patriotism the highest duty of all, but simply enjoins it as great and sacred.

And the Jews commonly heeded this injunction. They loved their country under all circumstances, and were ever ready to sacrifice individual interests and, eventually, their lives, for its integrity and safety. It was not because their ancient country had the name of Palestine that they loved it so dearly, but because they cherished the inherited belief of God superintending it specially for the sake of their forefathers, with whom He had made a covenant; and their polity was founded on the venerable Law of Moses, which, if properly followed and executed, would secure to them a state of peaceful progress; besides that, the national temple was their religious centre, exercising a powerful attraction

upon them. Had another country in the West, affording them like advantages, been assigned to them, they would have been given to it with the same degree of devotion as they were to Palestine.

They lost their country to the Babylonian conqueror Nebuchadnezzar, and were sorely grieved. What nation would not have been grieved at having to surrender their dear country and its accustomed institutions? Does it follow therefrom that, if the exiles found in the new country sheltering homes and friendly protection, they had to be forever embittered about their loss, holding themselves forlorn strangers amidst kindly benefactors, and continue regardless of the well-being of others, caring only for themselves? By no means. It is true that at the first time they were subjected to many hardships;[1] and they could not have loved their heathen masters who treated them cruelly and scoffed at their religion. But we know they were not of very long duration. The exiles must have materially been encouraged, too, by the exhortations of the inspired prophets who shared their exile with them, such as Ezekiel and the second Isaiah, the great unknown. Jeremiah's pathetic appeals, who communicated with them from Jerusalem, were also to that effect.

These prophets pointed out to them the sure though slow arrival of the divine help and deliverance from their captivity. Thus their grief subsided in course of time, and they endured their existing dependence as best they could. They took up various pursuits in which they were left unmolested, and became gradually used to the new order of things.

While continuing to cherish the hope of restoration, they did not fail in their duties to the Babylonian government, which for the most part consisted in paying taxes to it, their

---

[1] See Isaiah xlii. 22, li. 13; Ps. cxxxiv., cxxix.

communal and common affairs being, from the beginning of the captivity, conducted by a ruler of their own, the so-called Exilarch; the first one was Shealthiel, the grandson of the exiled prince Jehoiachin. In his family this dignity was inherited till the eleventh century of the Common Era.

To be loyal to their gentile rulers they were heartily advised by Jeremiah in a letter sent to them from Jerusalem: "Build ye houses and dwell in them, and plant gardens and eat the fruit of them; take ye wives, . . . and take wives for your sons. . . . And seek the peace of every city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives, and pray unto the Lord for it, for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace" (Jerem. xxix. 5–7). They had also a noble example of true loyalty in Daniel, who was made ruler over the whole province of Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. ii. 48), and served as minister both to Darius the Mede, and to Cyrus (ib. vi. 29).[1] He knew how to combine the duties of a loyal citizen and true patriot with a profound veneration and pious longing for the holy city. After praying three times a day, with his face turned to Jerusalem (Dan. vi. 11), or after his fervent supplication that "God may cause his face to shine again upon His sanctuary that is desolate," he could with refreshed spirits return to the duties of his post and discharge them not the less faithfully for having once more expressed that veneration and longing for the city and site of Israel's desolate sanctuary. He was, no doubt, for all his attachment to the far-off holy city, as true to his charge, as any minister of a modern Christian state can be to his.

The rest of the Jewish exiles were also, for aught we know,

[1] The Assyrian kings had already Israelites as public officers. King Salmanasar made Tobit his purveyor. Esarhaddon appointed the latter's nephew Achiacharus over his father's accounts, and over all his affairs (Tobit i. 13, 21).

dutiful citizens to the Babylonian and afterward Persian rulers, though they at the same time yearned for restoration. Cyrus would certainly not have given them permission to return and rebuild the city and temple (Ezra v. 14; Josephus, Ant., xi., 1), had they not deserved such royal favor by their loyalty to him. Nor would Artaxerxes I. have granted Ezra, the scribe, so large a commission and bountiful presents for the temple, and allowed all the Jews who desired it to accompany him to Jerusalem in 459 (Ezra vii.), or shown such kind regard to his Jewish cup-bearer Nehemiah, had all of them not proved worthy of his kindness.

"There was," says Rawlinson, "a friendly intimacy between the Persians and Jews that caused the latter to continue faithful to Persia to the last, and to brave the conqueror of Issus (Joseph, Ant., xi., 8, 3), rather than desert masters who had showed them kindness and sympathy.[1]

After the defeat of the last Achæmenian monarch, Darius Codomannus, they were also faithful to Alexander the Great and his successors in Syria and Egypt. "They fought in the armies of Xerxes against the Greeks, in the service of the Syrians against Rome and Egypt, as well as in the latter country against its foes from without. Antiochus the Great intrusted two thousand Babylonian Jews with guarding his provinces Lydia and Phrygia, where a sedition had broken out; for, wrote he to his general Zeuxis, "I am persuaded that they will be well-disposed guardians of our possessions, because of their piety towards God, and because . . . they are faithful, and with alacrity do what they are desired to do."[2] Another

---

[1] The Five Great Monarchies, Vol. IV., p. 340.

[2] Jos. Ant., xii., 3, 3.

Syrian king, Demetrius, granted to the Maccabee Jonathan that there be enrolled among the king's forces about thirty thousand Jews, unto whom pay shall be given . . . and of them some shall be placed in the king's strongholds, of whom also some shall be set over the affairs of the kingdom which are of trust."[1]

When the Parthians ruled over Babylonia, the Jews were likewise faithful to them. They even joined their armies in their expeditions to the West, especially against Jerusalem.[2] The Arsacidan governors were generally tolerant in religious matters,[3] which must have also benefited the Jews. Their sympathy for them was in proportion to the kind treatment they received at their hands. It is best illustrated by the saying of a rabbi of old, who compared their hosts with those of king David.[4] But for all their attachment to the Parthian rulers and their country, the Babylonian Jews did not relax their pious veneration for Jerusalem and its temple. They made their pilgrimage there in the holy seasons (Jos., Ant., xvii., 2), paid their yearly contribution of half a shekel towards the national sanctuary (ib., xviii., 9), and made themselves, besides, dependent on the instructions and decisions of the great council, the Synhedrin, residing at Jerusalem, especially in calendarial matters. All this dependence on the mother country had, however, only a religious bearing. In political respects, they felt themselves children of Babylonia, and were devoted to it and its rulers from their heart. Gradually even this religious dependence on Jerusalem decreased. When the temple was no more and the cultivation of religious science had, through prominent rabbis of

---

[1] 1 Macc. x. 36. See Jost, History of Judaism, I., p. 295.

[2] Jost, ib., p. 338.

[3] Vaux, History of Persia. p. 154.

[4] Kidushin, p. 72.

their own academies, as those of Sura and Nehardea, advanced so far that they needed no longer support from the mother country, the Babylonian Jews tried to liberate themselves from this dependence.[1] This was in the latter part of the second century Com. Era. From this time Babylonia was respected as another holy land.

To one great Babylonian, Mar Samuel, who was at that time president of the academy of Nehardea, belongs the memorable maxim: "The law of the country has to rule us," were it even in conflict with some of our religious customs. This maxim met with no opposition from other rabbis, but was readily adopted and observed by all the Jews thereafter. A modern Jewish historian, Grätz, says of it, that eminent Babylonian rabbi translated Jeremiah's admonition of old into a religious precept, and that to both these leading men Judaism owed the possibility of its existence in foreign lands.[2]

Samuel's disciple, Rab Judah, pronounced it even a sin to emigrate from Babylonia to Palestine, and this saying was quite congenial to the sentiments of all the Jewish people there, who had a profound love of their country at heart.

Samuel's patriotic labors tended materially to soften the sectarian prejudices nourished against the Jews through the fanatic Magi, who arose to great influence when Ardeshir, the first Sassanian king, assumed the reins of the Parthian government, in 226, Common Era. Samuel was a true friend to his son and successor, Sapores, and supported him with all his might and influence; he, on his part, was very friendly to his Jewish subjects, much like Cyrus of old.[3]

After following up the history of the exiles and their

[1] See Mar Samuel's Life by Hoffman, p. 35.

[2] History of the Jews, IV., p. 288.

[3] Hoffman, p. 46.

descendants in Babylonia through more than eight centuries, and proving from it, as we did, their patriotism to the various gentile governments, let us also review briefly the bearing of the Egyptian Jews in those remote periods.

Those of Alexandria in Egypt were also faithful citizens, and equal rights with the Macedonians were given them by Alexander the Great, "because he had, upon a careful trial, found them all to have been men of virtue and fidelity to him" (Josephus against Apion, ii., 4). Ptolemy, son of Lagus, "intrusted the fortresses of Egypt into their hands, as believing they would keep them faithfully and valiantly for him" (ib.). Ptolemy Philometor and his wife Cleopatra "committed their whole kingdom to Jews, when Onias and Dositheus, both Jews, were the generals of their army" (ib.). These Jews, loyal to the crown, brought also the insurgent Alexandrians "to terms of agreement, and freed them from the miseries of a civil war." And it was Onias who "undertook a war against the usurper Ptolemy Physco, on Cleopatra's account; nor would he desert that trust the royal family had reposed in him, in their distress." His army was mainly composed of Jews, as is evident from Josephus' report. And these Jews were as loyal and patriotic to the Egyptian line as the English race ever could be to Her Majesty in any critical condition of her empire.

Speak of patriotism as the exclusive property of the "English race," when the Egyptian Jews, though followers of Jehovah, had already in such a remote period, from Alexander to Augustus, proved a sincere and valorous devotion to gentile governments! They were as little urged to it by a "Jewish and plutopolitan motive," as any descendant of the Saxons, who worshipped the great Woden, the German god of war, can ever be suspected of a similar motive, when called by his country to defend and protect her interests.

Let us also examine Jewish patriotism in the time of the Maccabees. For although their only aim was to save the Jewish state and religious institutions from the reckless violence of the Syrians, it must be conceded that people who are so warmly attached to their country as to fly to arms and fight bravely for maintaining and restoring civil and religious liberty to themselves and their countrymen, are patriots indeed, whether they hail from the East or the West, and be their religious creed whatever it may. Such stanch and heroic men, urged by the dictates of their brave spirit to help rescuing their country from present or impending perils, would do the same and manifest the same patriotic zeal for the threatened interests of England or America as for Judea. Politically, Judea was to the Maccabees no more and no dearer than England or America is to any of her present Jewish citizens, enjoying as they do equally with those of the Christian faith all civil rights and the beneficial protection of the law. History exhibits no more illustrious patterns of patriotism than the Maccabees. When Antiochus Epiphanes issued and enforced his edict that all the Jews of his empire should forsake their religion, enacting the first religious persecution against our race, the venerable Mattathias, a resident priest of Modin, arose and lamented bitterly: "Woe me! wherefore was I born to see this misery of my people and of the holy city!" (1 Mac. ii. 7). Nor did he stop short at mere remonstrance; he left his comfortable home, and, summoning all the courage of his old age, worked zealously with his sons and followers, few as they were, to rescue the sacred Law from the revilements of the heathen (ib. ii. 48). The maintenance of this Law was to the Maccabees identical with that of their political independence. Church and state were to the Israelitish commonwealth of old one and the same. The Mosaic Code was their law, governing

both their civil and religious affairs. To secure that law from outward infringements and profanation was the noble task of the Maccabees.

To that end Judas Maccabee fought the powerful armies of the Syrians, who were bent on destroying the land and the people. He and his brothers led the brave warriors with the fixed purpose of relieving their downtrodden brethren, and recovering both their independence and the security of the national sanctuary (ib. iii. 43). Judas' brother Eleazar, "put himself in jeopardy to the end he might deliver his people," (ib. vi. 44). When Judas' position against Bacchides became so desperate that his men warned him against venturing upon an engagement with the superior forces of the enemy, asking him to retreat for a while until they could be reinforced by others troops, he would not heed their advice, rejoining resolutely: "God forbid that I should do this thing and flee away from them: if our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren and let us not stain our honor" (ib. ix. 10).

He died, indeed, in the ensuing battle, for his brethren whom he strove so patriotically to relieve and save. Such patriotism has never been surpassed. His own patriotic zeal kindled that of his brave followers, so that they were ready to die "for the laws and the country" (ib. ii. 8, 21, see also ib. 11, 7 and 13, 10). They prepared themselves for the bloody task by fasting, praying, and other religious exercises, leaving their camp for the battle-field with the memorable watchword: "The help of God" or "Victory is of God" (ib. ii. 8, 23; 13, 15).

Can the members of the English race consecrate their patriotism in a more appropriate way? Would that all, Christians and Jews, follow the noble example of the

Maccabean heroes, whenever they are called upon to defend a good cause!

Who must not wonder at the remarkable valor displayed by the Jews in their tremendous struggle of independence against the Romans which was carried on for five years, from 65 to 70, Common Era. This struggle resembles the American Revolution in many respects. The Jews had the same grievances against the Roman dominion as the American colonies against the English; theirs were even more and stronger. The Romans levied exorbitant taxes upon the inhabitants of the Jewish provinces; of course, without their consent, as the colonists complained in our Declaration. Since Augustus subdued Judea and incorporated it as a province into the Roman empire, their duties and the way of exacting them became more and more intolerable. This provoked their keen discontent and a strong desire for redress. They had formerly, without opposition, borne the most burdensome taxation. Until the time of Antiochus the Great they were paying to their foreign rulers the poll-money, the crown-tax, and other taxes (Jos., Ant., xii., 3, 3). The tribute imposed by him and his successors was also oppressive enough (1 Macc. xii. 29–31, 42; xi. 34–35). The Jews calmly submitted to it.

The new Roman system, however, with all its heinous annoyances, stung their national pride to the quick and offended their feelings greatly. It was heinous to them, not from any superstition, because their names were to be entered in the tax-roll which would be sinful, like David's numbering the people (2 Sam. xxiv.), as Renan states in his Life of Jesus. We are not informed by the historians that their religious sentiments rebelled against the enrollment itself. It was only the taxation by Quirinius "of their substance,"[1]

[1] Jos., Ant., xviii., 1, 1.

their income, that aroused their disaffection, as it would open the way for dishonest practices and cruel exactions by the tax farmers. Their hard-earned produce was now valued by irresponsible publicans. Subjecting it to a fluctuating price, they could the easier defraud the Jewish husbandmen.

This class of Roman officers was generally corrupt, exhibiting such an infamous greediness that they were shunned and hated by all. Jesus was aware of it when he told those coming to him to be baptized: "Exact no more than that which is appointed you (Luke iii. 13). The popular voice branded them as sinners (ib. xix. 7), an appellation too mild, indeed, for such pitiless wretches. For they not only taxed the substance of the people at their arbitrary estimate, they frequently brought to account those who were unable to pay. This we learn from an old Jewish source (Pesikta, Shekalim, p. 11): "The Romans first ask the poll-tax, then the demos (the state tax), and the eranos (another tribute), and, if one cannot pay, he has to swear to it, and to suffer corporal penalties."

Such abuses, entailed by the new system of taxation, must have provoked even the most peaceable citizens. It is very likely, therefore, that the movement of Judas, of Galilee, the founder of the party of the zealots, against it in the "days of taxing," sprang from these abuses, real and apprehended, rather than from his opposition to paying tribute at all, were it justly imposed and collected. Josephus does not say[1] that he dissuaded the people from paying it at the first introduction of the census, so we are free to presume he did so only after this vicious system had been in operation for some time.

But admitting that he and his zealous partisans were

[1] Jos., Wars, ii., 8, 1.

fiercely opposed to Roman taxation at all, were they to blame for it? It was altogether too burdensome. The Jews were already in the reign of Tiberius so much borne down by the tribute that they had to appeal to him for its diminution (Tacitus Annal., ii., 42). Even Jesus was opposed to it as an unheard-of irregularity (Matthew, xvii. 24), disapproving only its open refusal (ib. xxii. 15). In like manner did the rabbis warn from eluding the tribute (Talmud, Succah, p. 30), though they felt the Roman oppression as deeply as their common brethren.

And were these not patient long enough? For nearly sixty years, from the beginning of the census, they endured the most inhuman exactions without resorting to an open revolt, until it was inevitable.

It was mainly brought on through the Roman procurators, who were, with few exceptions, unprincipled, greedy, and cruel men, offering the greatest insults to the Jews and their religious sentiments.

Pilate brought by stealth the images of Tiberius into the holy city, an affront the Jews could not bear, from their religious horror of all image worship. Petronius was to place Caligula's statues in the temple at the emperor's request. The contemptuous behavior of a Roman soldier under Cumanus, and this man's insolent disregard of the Jewish rights, increased the dissatisfaction. The emperor Claudius was urged to banish him for it. The same Claudius, who, as Tacitus reports, "gave over the province of Judea to Roman knights and freedmen, one of whom, Felix, wielded the despotic power with a knavish spirit, committing all kinds of cruelty and tyranny."[1] "And yet," adds this historian, "did the Jews keep patience until Florus became procurator; under him the war broke out."

[1] Histor., v., 9.

This corrupt and rapacious hireling stole seventeen talents out of the temple treasury, and "publicly proclaimed it all the country over, that all had liberty given them to turn robbers, upon this condition, that he might go shares with them in the spoils."[1]

Such outrages perpetrated by the Roman authorities and soldiery were beyond bearing. They had to look on them as fixed enemies. No wonder, then, that the patriots rose up zealously in defence of their honor and liberty. Had they been unanimous, not divided into factions, each pursuing the aim of independence in its own way, the Roman power might have been crushed at the outbreak of the revolution. But despite their party conflicts, they were one in their exasperation at the Roman outrages, and all of them were kindled with a sincere, patriotic zeal. They aimed at no worldly gain; all they strove to acquire was personal and religious freedom. For this they were ready to die. Their glory is by no means diminished by the co-existence of a class of low Jews, who were gratifying their grudge against suspected opponents of the common cause by frequent assassinations, or who sought to profit by the disorder and anarchy of those excited times. It is true there were then Sicarii, robbers, among the Jews. But to speak of the warriors of the revolution as robbers, as the Jewish historian Josephus did, is a flagrant calumny. He calls John of Gischala a tyrant, his men robbers, and all the revolutionists "the seditious." But they deserved these opprobrious names as little as the heroes of the American revolution deserved to be called rebels by the British.

History chronicles no more signal defence of a beloved place than that by the Jewish patriots of their temple in the last phase of their fearful struggle, when all the factions of

[1] Josephus, Wars, xiv., 2.

the zealots forgot their mutual hostilities in their common interest to save that national sanctuary. Even the peaceful and retired sect of the Essenes took up arms against the common foe, like a large number of Quakers in the American war who joined the Philadelphia companies to fight for independence, though their religious scruples forbade them the use of arms.

The Roman legions, led by Titus, when about to raise banks against the tower of Antonia, were greatly discouraged, because "they found the Jews' courageous souls to be superior to the multitude of the miseries they were under." Even Josephus, while he could but belittle the merits of the revolutionists, declared, at the same time, their courage to be "peculiar to our nation" (Wars, vi., 1, 3).

This very courage it was that kept the Jewish patriots fighting to the last. Although Josephus states elsewhere that their great encouragements were "their fear for themselves and for their temple and the presence of the tyrant," John of Gischala, whom he reports to have boasted "that he did never fear the taking of Jerusalem, because it was God's own city," we know that it was only his personal grudge against this leader that bade him deny the bravery of the Jewish warriors at that time. Their high courage and great patriotism, however, availed them nothing. The fortress of Antonia fell, and then the temple. But it took the Romans fully six weeks before the temple was destroyed. The Roman colossus had to struggle hard with the "constancy and patience of the Jews even under their ill-successes," a confession made by Titus himself in his address to the army (Wars, vi., 1, 5).

In this theatre of war there were famous actors, such as Eleazar, John, and Simon, and hundreds of other patriots who fought gallantly, in the severe straits of famine, for

their independence and freedom. "There were more Jews who furnished themselves with arms for the defence of the national cause than could actually participate," reports Tacitus, adding, moreover, that, "in firmness the Jewish women were equal to the men; and when the Jews were forced to surrender their positions, they manifested a greater fear of life than death."[1] If such an historian as Tacitus, who was all but a friend of the Jews, bears testimony to their great valor and patriotic zeal, we can easily pass over their denunciation as robbers by Josephus, who was, nevertheless, bold enough to say that, "while he is alive, he would never be in such a slavery as to forego his own kindred."

Jerusalem fell a second time. The temple was laid in ashes. The Jewish state ceased. The insolent victors took the most cruel advantage over the captive matron, Judea. The survivors of the bloody struggle were at the mercy of the Romans. And now they began to scatter broadcast over all parts of the inhabited globe. Vespasian converted the traditional yearly temple tax of the didrachma into a tribute to the Capitol of Rome, initiating the famous Jew tax that lasted, in its various modifications, more than seventeen hundred years, as an emblem either of the longevity of the Jews or of undying prejudice. This tribute was levied alike on the eastern and western Jews. It seems, however, to have been abolished after Vespasian's death, because we are told that the Jewish patriarchs of Palestine used to collect it for themselves until Emperor Theodosius II. peremptorily decided it must be paid into the imperial treasury, in the year 429.

This tribute was afterwards claimed by the German emperors, who assumed also the title and privileges of Roman

[1] Ib. v. 13.

kings. The Schwabenspiegel, one of the oldest German codes of law, edited before the year 1276, speaks of the Jews as the property of the German-Roman empire inherited from Titus, and that they, therefore, stood under its immediate protection. In reward for such protectorate, the German emperors, from the tenth century on, asked of the Jews that ancient tribute under the name of crown money (aurum coronarium). Had it proved efficient, securing their life and property, it would have well been worth its amount—one Rhenish gilder for every Jewish head of twelve years on every Christmas. But neither could the best of the emperors protect them thoroughly, nor did they confine their claims upon the Jews to that yearly tribute alone. They had, besides, to pay to each one after his election the so-called third penny or the crown tax, as a ransom for their lives that could be taken by him, according to a later interpretation, any time at his pleasure; only that he would have to leave alive a few for a constant memorial. Thereto was added the common tax on their real estate, half of which belonged to the emperor, and the other half to the provincial or municipal authorities. Then came the tenth penny, a kind of income tax for their privilege of free traffic. Then certain obligatory presents to some state officials. They had also to furnish the parchment for the chancery of the empire, and at Frankfort, to lend all the bedding required for the imperial court, whenever it held its session there. In the train of these impositions was the tithe collected by the churches, and other arbitrary requisitions by princes and ecclesiastical rulers.

Such were their duties during the middle ages, and in part to the end of the last century. Were they to love a country crushing them with intolerable burdens? And did these secure them life and property? They did not.

A regular system of massacre and pillage was inaugurated

against them from the beginning of the crusades, those "wild and romantic adventures." The best meaning emperors and citizens were generally unable to prevent and sometimes even to suppress these persecutions. The "holy warriors" gave the Jews the alternative of conversion or death, or simply plundered them under the pretext of their being outlawed enemies of Christ. Count Emicho had in the first crusade alone appropriated 12,000 ducats of the Jews' money. The Archbishop of Mayence himself was believed to have shared in the spoils of the then plundered Jews of that city. Some of his near relatives were on solid testimony held to account for participating in that robbery by Henry IV., who, on his return to the empire in 1098, was earnestly intent on all possible restitution being made to the Jews who had lost so much in the bloody raids, or were the heirs of the victims two years before. Even the property of the Jews yielding to conversion, forced on them in these benighted times, was not always safe. Some kings and princes losing through their conversion the regular Jewish revenue, sought to indemnify themselves by confiscating their property, though they were now nominal Christians.[1] This was a short and easy financial process, as was that of the noble kings John and Henry III., of England, the former imprisoning his Jews to force them to surrender their money, from one of whom were taken seven teeth, one on each subsequent day, till on the eighth he ransomed the remainder of his teeth at the price demanded, 10,000 marcs of silver; the latter extorting 10,000 marcs from the Jews by making ten of their richest men bound for their payment.[2] Well may the "English race" be "proud" of such magnanimous princes, and "happy" to count them among the leaders of English Christian civilization!

[1] Montesquieu, L'esprit des lois, II., 21, 16, who states that this outrageous practice had been abolished by law in 1392.

[2] Tovey, Anglia Judaica.

The Christian Councils held under the auspices of the Frank and Visigoth monarchs sowed the seed of intolerance against the Jews which soon grew into a rank crop. Greedy potentates, fanatic and rapacious masses, and demoralized priests were eagerly gathering it. They drove the Jews out of the pale of society, nay treated them as outcasts of humanity deserving no human sympathy. The Christian law of the Middle Ages forbade the Jews to hold Christian servants. When they had to take an oath in court, they were compelled to stand on a hog-skin, repeating after the magistrate the most abominable execrations as a threat for perjury. To be outwardly known from Christians, as their complexion was often deceiving, they had to wear badges on their clothes, as if their common "badge of sufferance" alone had not sufficed to distinguish them from others.

The Council at Narbonne, in 1227, decreed it should be of cloth in the form of a wheel, and the synod of Augsburg, in 1452, was seriously engaged in ordering separate badges for both sexes, a round rag of saffron color about the breas for the male, and two grayish ruffles for the female Jews. Those of England had to wear a yellow badge, by virtue of an act of Parliament under Edward I. They were not long adorned with it, however, that generous king expelling them from his domain in the year 1290.

Another mark of distinction was the Jew hat. The synod of Vienna, in 1267, and of Salzburg, in 1418, made it a penal law for the Jews to wear cornered hats, that they might be known distinctly from Christians. Süsskind von Trimberg, the homeless Jewish minstrel of the 13th century, alludes in his poems, as Delitzsch[1] supposes, to this monstrous outgrowth of Christian intolerance.

The German emperors and the kings and princes of Christian Europe assuming the ownership of their dependent

[1] See Orient of 1840, p. 145 seq.

Jews, they were from time to time presented by them as gifts, or mortgaged like inanimate property to other rulers or imperial cities. Every public calamity was laid to their charge, even the pestilence of 1348–50 that ravaged fearfully throughout Europe. They were falsely accused of having poisoned the wells, and thereby caused that fell plague. Innumerable innocent Jews were then murdered or publicly burned at the stake; their princely protectors could not overawe the excited populace. In the Age of Reformation, when a broader intelligence began to spread among the masses, releasing their benumbed minds from the bane of religious ignorance, the wholesale massacres and pillages of the Jews ceased, to give way only to their wholesale expulsions from their oldest settlements.

Could they have loved a country where their race was doomed to continued oppression, misery, and disgrace, and kept in constant jeopardy of life and property? Had they really a country in the dark Middle Ages? No, they had "but the grave."

And yet even in these barbarous ages the Jews were not wanting in patriotism to those communities whose government and gentile citizens had sense of humanity enough to treat them as human beings, if not as equal brethren. Not to speak of the many high and honorable positions given to prominent Jews of Mohammedan Spain, I will quote several instances of the kind occurring in Christian countries proper.

It can be proved beyond doubt that, despite the Christian law forbidding the Jews to hold administrative or judicial offices, or to serve in the armies of Christian states even in urgent cases of defense,[1] some princes and communities be-

[1] Edict of Theodosius II. from the year 439. Only the burdensome and expensive office of decurions was allowed to or rather imposed on them by Constantine, according to his order for Cologne in 321, and afterward by Justinian.

stowed various posts of honor and trust on such of their Jews as they found trustworthy and able. In one of the gloomiest periods of Jewish history, in the year 1259, the provincial Council of Mayence issued an ordinance forbidding the Jews to continue in any secular dignity or public office.[1] This shows that they were until then actually occupying such positions.

Duke Leopold of Austria, in the twelfth century, had a Jew, Solomon, appointed as superintendent of his mint, an office of trust he held also under his son and successor, Frederick.[2] Two Jewish brothers, Lublin and Nekelo, were functionaries of an Austrian Duke, about the year 1257.[3] It may not be amiss to mention here also, that the Jewish physicians of the middle ages, were, notwithstanding the contrary ecclesiastical injunctions,[4] of great service to many municipalities, popes, and princes. Even the bigoted Duke Albrecht of Bavaria, the grandson of the Emperor Lewis, in his sickness, sent abroad for a Jewish doctor, Jacob, who attended him in his palace till he was cured. This was in the year 1392.

And though the old German-Christian law interdicted the Jews to bear arms,[5] they knew nevertheless how to wield and use them in their own defense,[6] as well as of those governments and cities which afforded them protection.

---

[1] Mansi, Conciliorum nova collectio, vol. xxiii., p. 997.

[2] Monumenta boica, IV., No. 115.

[3] Meichelbeck, Historia Frisingensis, II., p. 47.

[4] The council of Vienna, 1267, ordered that no Jewish physician should practise in Christian families.

[5] Sachsenspiegel, libr. iii., art. 2.

[6] During their persecution by Rindfleisch, in 1298, the forts of Nüremberg and Neumarkt were offered them as places of refuge. Therein they defended themselves by force of arms, many Christians of those cities joining and assisting them. Pertz, Monumenta Ger-

When once, in the thirteenth century, the city of Worms was besieged, Rabbi Eleazar, the leading divine of the Jews there, requested them to fly to arms, and this on a Sabbath day, as he considered it their urgent duty to defend the threatened place.[1] King Philip the Handsome, of France, is said to have had thirty thousand Jews in his army, in his expedition against Count Guy of Flanders, 1297, who had renounced his allegiance to him Whether he levied them against their will is not reported, though it is very likely, from his tyranny to his Jews soon after, that he aimed to expose them to the fatal chances of the first engagements, as the chronicler has it.[2]

The Jews had also in previous centuries proved their sincere patriotism and bravery in defense of Christian cities. The Jews of Arles in France, after it was conquered by the Visigoth king Euric, in 477, enjoyed perfect liberty and equality, and were in return so much attached to the city that they offered readily their lives in its defense. When it was besieged by the Franks and Burgundians, in 508, they held firmly to the rightful king, resisting by force of arms the assaults of the invaders. They disclosed also the traitorous conspiracy of the bishop Cæsarius against the city, for which he was sentenced to prison.[3]

Likewise did the Jews of Naples exhibit a brave spirit when it was threatened with immediate danger by the besieging forces of the Byzantine conqueror, Belisarius.

---

maniæ, vol. xvii., p. 419.—The Christian community of Augsburg guarded their Jews from the assaults of this villain. Out of gratitude for it, they built at their own expense, alongside their cemetery, a wall *for the protection of the city.*

[1] Rokeach, § 196, a treatise by the same rabbi on Jewish rites and customs. [2] Pertz, Monumenta Germaniæ, xvii., p. 417.

[3] Dr. H. Gross in Grätz' Monatschrift, March, 1878.

He was sent, at the command of the Emperor Justinian, to take the city by force, in 536. The Jewish inhabitants, who were enjoying greater toleration than their brethren living in the Byzantine empire, held themselves bound to their king, the Ostrogoth Theodoric, and would not forsake him in the hour of peril. They called upon their gentile fellow-citizens to stand up resolutely in the defense of their common liberties, offering even to furnish the entire population gratuitously with the necessaries of life during the siege. Their own companies held the sea-side all alone, fully prepared to meet the foe, who, however, did not dare to attack this so well-defended part of the city. They met bravely all the dangers surrounding them at last, when one night the foe suddenly broke into the city, and captured it after a desperate battle. The Jews fought as heroes.[1]

Their number and names have not been recorded by jealous history. But the fact of their sincere patriotism suffices to convince any unprejudiced mind that the Jews *can be and are true friends to their country, if the country is a true friend to them.*

But from the time of Charlemagne to the great Napoleon, Christian countries manifested an unaccountable hatred to the Jews, debarring them from common society by the most offensive treatment, and trampling on all their human rights. Say what you will, *the Jews were never wanting in patriotism, but the Christians were in charity.* The Reformation clearing away abuses of the Church, by no means carried away prejudices against our race. The intolerance of its leaders was as great as of the overbearing dignitaries of the ruling church. Nor was the Christian populace more inclined to tolerate the Jews, since they had imbibed the new doc-

[1] Grätz, History of the Jews, v., 50–57.

trines. It was asserted that in the Peasants' War, 1525, the Jews suffered no ill-treatment, because they supported the cause of the imperial cities and the revolted peasants of Germany against the princes and nobility. But this assertion has been refuted by an able Jewish writer, who proved that the insurgent peasants were not at all disposed to spare the Jews and their property. Pillages and expulsion of Jews were the order of the day in that revolution, which they may have kept off here and there by rich presents.[1]

They were hated then as they were afterwards, the light of the Reformation notwithstanding. It was left to the growing enlightenment of the last century gradually to soften and dispel the fierce prejudices against our race. Its apostles contributed greatly to the amelioration of their condition. The great Lessing did mighty service to the German Jews. His friend Mendelssohn, the German Socrates as he was called, co-operated with him in destroying the popular hatred and ill-will against them. The latter had himself sorely suffered from it. It hurt him painfully that "in so many a beloved city of the fatherland no Jew, even after paying the prescribed tax on his body, was in broad daylight allowed to stay without being closely watched, for fear he might pursue a Christian child, or poison the wells; when at night they would not tolerate him at all, for his reputed communication with evil spirits." He worked hard to break down the wall of social separation and discrimination between Christians and Jews. It was hard work, as he himself despondently remarked, "You may cut the roots of prejudices in twain, and yet they will thrive, drawing their nourishment from the air, if not from the ground." But contemporaneously with the praiseworthy efforts of those and other champions of humanity in Christian

[1] Alfred Stern, in Geiger's Zeitschrift, 1870, first number, p. 57 seq.

Europe, a political storm arose on the American continent, uprooting systematically all that was left of the mediæval prejudices of race and rank. The solemn Declaration by the American Congress of 1776 of "the self-evident truth, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" was the new gospel removing in principle all civil disadvantages and disabilities imposed on any class of human beings on account of their descent or religion. Every letter of it was inspired and could safely be adopted by sensible and upright people of all creeds. Jew and Christian alike could swear to its infallible truths. And while the fathers of our Republic made this Declaration good by vindicating and securing unshackled liberty to the thirteen colonies, they at the same time vindicated implicitly the human rights of the Jews, withheld from them for nearly fifteen hundred years.

The French Revolution followed, destroying the old society and its ancient abuses. Till then, "society had yet the forms of the middle age. The common people had no rights at all." The privileged orders, the nobility and clergy, allowed them no ascendency. The revolution replaced these privileges by the equality of all citizens. This was guaranteed to all French citizens alike, the Jews, of course, included. The year 1793 brought them this long-desired boon.

However, one must not think that their liberties passed at once from the statute into reality. As there were yet many bloody battles to be fought, from the Declaration of American Independence to its practical existence, so had the French Jews to struggle many years till the principle of full equality was actually applied in their relations to the state.

Even Napoleon the Great, pretending, as he did, to put an end to the rotten state of the past, would not regard the Jews

as citizens, even so late as in the year 1806. He then declared: "The Jews are not in the same category with the Christians. We have to judge them by the political, not the civil right, for they are no citizens." He had, however, the earnest desire to make citizens of them. To that end he convened a respectable number of Jewish deputies, in 1806, charging them to state and explain truly the obstacles, if there were any, to Jewish citizenship, emanating from their religion. One of the questions put to that body was:

Do the Jews born in France, and considered by the law as her citizens, regard this country as theirs, even so far as to be obliged eventually to defend her?

They solemnly answered: "People who chose for themselves a fatherland, living therein since many centuries, and who, even under oppressive laws, felt such an attachment to it that they did rather forego the enjoyment of civil liberties than quit it: such cannot but think themselves Frenchmen in France, and the obligation to defend her is to them an honorable and precious one.—Jeremiah advised the Jews of Babylonia to regard this land as their country, though they were to have stayed there only seventy years. They followed this advice to such a degree that, when Cyrus permitted the exiles to return to their mother country, only 42,360 of them would avail themselves of that permission.

"Love of country is such a natural and profound sentiment among the Jews, and so corresponding to their religious belief, that a French Jew would think himself a stranger on English territory, even in his intercourse with co-religionists, the same being true of English Jews in France.

"This sentiment prevails among them in such a measure that in the late wars one could see frequently French Jews[1] fight

[1] Of 77,000 Jews in all the French provinces, there were, about that time, 797 in active military service (Grätz's History, Vol. xi., p. 304).

with fierce animosity against those of the hostile ranks. Many of them are now beset with scars, as the glorious marks of their patriotic devotion, and others have been praised and distinguished for their bravery on the field of honor."

This declaration of the Jewish deputies was, the next year, sanctioned by the Synhedrin, the Jewish council, convened at Paris. Napoleon acted henceforth according to this trustworthy information, treating the Jews, in all the countries that were under his rule, as full citizens. Those of the new kingdom of Westphalia and of Frankfort were released from the miserable bondage they had so many centuries endured. The gates of their gloomy quarters were, with the entrance of the French officials, suddenly opened, and out they could go and stride, along with the hitherto privileged race, on the highway of freedom, secured by the mighty conqueror. Adjoining states could not well stand back any longer, and commenced also liberating the Jews. King Frederick William III. had given the Jews of Prussia the local citizenship in 1809, followed, in 1812, by their perfect emancipation, on the condition of performing all civil duties, especially military service.

No sooner were they promised this equality with their Christian fellow-citizens, than they hastened to prove themselves worthy of the royal kindness and confidence. In the ensuing wars of independence, they responded readily to the summons of their king, rallying round the Prussian standard with an exemplary patriotism. According to the Prussian *Military Gazette* of 1843, there served in the campaigns of 1813–14, out of the then small Jewish population, 263 volunteers and 80 regulars. The same paper states that in 1815, when the Prussian army had its largest strength, the number of Jewish soldiers in it may have been, according to the

former ratio, 731. This computation was, however, contested by well informed Jewish writers as being too low, considering the fact that in 1815 there were 30 Jews in one battalion of volunteer riflemen alone. In one such detachment of but 200 men there were 7 Jews, 2 of them—the brothers Simon—were among the first fifteen who joined the ranks as volunteers. Hardenberg, the Prussian chancellor, in a letter to the Count von Grote, dated January 4th, 1815, gave the Jews the following testimony: "The history of our late war with France shows already that the Jews have, by their faithful allegiance to the state conferring equal rights on them, proved worthy of it. The young men of the Jewish faith were the military comrades of their Christian fellow-citizens, of whom we can present instances of true heroism and glorious braving of the dangers of war. The rest of the Jewish inhabitants, especially the ladies, vied with the Christians in all kinds of patriotic sacrifices." To this we could add several more faithful testimonies of the gallantry of Jewish soldiers in the Prussian army.[1] Where did this patriotism spring from? From a "Jewish and plutopolitan motive," or from growing love to a country that seemed gradually to arrive at the sense of justice towards their oppressed race? Even Professor Smith will beware of imputing an impure motive to these Prussian Jews. Nor will he be able to uphold his pretext any longer, that the Jews serve as soldiers only where military service is compulsory, as in modern Prussia. Their service in the Prussian and other German armies, during the wars of independence, was, for the most part, voluntary.

So was also that of the Jewish soldiers in our late civil war. Co. H, of the Sixty-sixth Volunteer Regiment, that took part in many battles, had mainly co-religionists in its ranks.

[1] See Grätz's History, Vol. xi., pp. 320–21 and 334.

One of the Missouri regiments was principally composed of Jews. One-half of the line officers of the sixth New York regiment were Jews. The officers of Col. Einstein's Philadelphia regiment were mostly Jews. Generals Lyon and Newman, who fell on the field of battle, were Jews. The American Jews displayed a laudable readiness in responding to the call of their country for its protection. "Everywhere in the loyal States they had come nobly forth among the very first to offer upon the altar of the sacred Union their might, intellect, treasure, and, if need be, their very heart's blood." "No body of citizens surpassed us Israelites in the devoted love for this glorious Union, in fervent patriotism, and the firm determination in its defense 'to do or to die.'" There were out of half a million men of the Union army not less than five thousand Jews in active service. They enlisted in the same proportion with the rest of the population, not as Jews, but as free and equal citizens of this Republic. They were largely represented, not only among the privates, but also among the commissioned officers.

Moreover, many of the Jews who were then sworn in for the war were mechanics with large families to support, which they had to commend to the charge or charity of others, whilst they would be absent on their highest duty to their country. Was this no patriotism? If not, will Prof. Smith be kind enough to define what else it was? Or will he not rather change his prejudiced mind and do us justice again by allowing us the same love of country as other races, even the English, after reading the following account of a Jewish participant of that civil struggle? "Here, in the forests of Virginia, are the descendants of the Hebrew patriarch Abraham; behold them now in the New World shedding their blood for the maintenance of the liberties secured to them by

this Republic; and that while thus reflecting, he had heard some of his brethren utter the old Jewish declaration of faith: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One."

This touching instance at the same time answers Professor Smith's query as to the political bearing of Judaism, and what are the relations between country and race in the mind of a strict Jew. Judaism teaches gratitude to whomsoever it is due, and the American Jews proved their heartfelt gratitude for their civil and religious equality, which, throughout the Union, is the unquestioned right of every citizen, in helping to defend their country to the last moment. Judaism teaches the Unity of God, and therefore a strict Jew will profess it even on the battle-field. Judaism teaches fraternal good-will to all fellow-beings; therefore, a strict Jew readily joins with his Christian brethren in furthering the welfare of the community. In times of peace or war he is, by virtue of his religion and modern education, as good a subject and citizen as any one else. This proposition ought to "convince" Professor Smith and make him "cease to cling to the miserable" prejudice that Judaism is a religion of race and tribal. If the Jew have tribal affiliations, they do not prevent him exercising his various duties to the commonwealth of which he is a member. No tribal relations whatever were considered by the American Jewish soldiers of both armies. The Confederate Jew, defending the cause of his section, saw in his co-religionist of the other side, had he even recognized him as such in the heat of battle, but a foe whom he held it his patriotic duty to conquer; and so did the Jew of the Union forces. The ruling motives of all the Jewish soldiers in both armies were exclusively those which actuated every other patriotic American. This will readily be acknowledged by all Americans living. And the General-in-Chief included certainly in his praise to the Union soldiers, on dismissing

them, June 2d, 1865, the great number of Jews who had also, "in obedience to their country, left their homes and families, and volunteered in her defense." They were among those who, "by their patriotic devotion to their country in the hour of danger and alarm, have maintained the supremacy of the Union and the Constitution."

And what the American Jew was and is capable of, should not the English be? Is he of a different nature? By no means. Only a morbid hatred of our race could have dictated Prof. Smith's disparaging opinion, that it is beyond the legislator's power to make patriots of the English Jews. It ever and everywhere depended solely on legislation to make the Jews love their country. The ordinance of Edward I., banishing all the Jews from the English soil, could certainly not have inspired them with love for it. The 16,511 wretched Jews who were on the 31st of August, 1290, pitilessly driven from a country inhabited by their ancestors as far back as the eighth century, if not earlier, could no longer be attached to it and its monarch. Nor even was it reasonable to expect from those Jews who, by the connivance of the rulers came into London in the latter part of the seventeenth century, to be at once warm patriots. They had to pay dearly for such toleration which allowed them only to live there as isolated strangers, without the right to purchase houses or practise professions.

To make them patriots it was necessary to make them citizens first. As our venerable Cremieux remarked once: "If you persecute, you make slaves; only by declaring equal rights for all you will make good citizens." Nevertheless, the third generation of those Jewish settlers who were natives, and more so the fourth, being purely English, felt themselves as Englishmen. They were grateful for the scanty toleration they enjoyed, and proved themselves "zealously national

already in the reign of George I., firm adherents to the Protestant succession."[1]

The naturalization act followed in 1753. It was strenuously advocated by the liberal ministry of George II. But the opposition was too strong to carry it into effect. It was repealed by the next session of Parliament—"a sacrifice to the bigotry of the populace."[2] And, let us add, to their narrow jealousy.

It is true, the religion of the Jews had ever alarmed the English fanatics. In the council held by Cromwell on their re-admission, the invited preachers were fiercely opposed to it, on the ground that Judaism might once become the established religion.[3] In 1703, but a short time after their silent re-admission, when under Charles II., in 1663,[4] there resided altogether twelve Jews in London, an anonymous appeal to the clergy was issued, denouncing their toleration as illegal, the laws banishing them having never been repealed.[5] And so late as 1841, in the parliamentary debate on the Jews' Declaration Bill, Sir Robert Inglis expressed his fear that, if it were passed, it would unchristianize England.[6]

It was alleged again and again, also by E. W. Gladstone, that the Jewish disqualification was due to their religion, Christianity being part and parcel of the law of England.

We are unable to ascertain whether any or how much of narrow jealousy was mixed with the outspoken prejudices of those objectors to Jewish emancipation. We only know that it was ever prevalent in England. Their religion was often but the pretext put forth to lessen the odium of the meanest prejudices against them. The above-mentioned anonymous writer, arguing against those favoring their

---

[1] Christian correspondent, *Jewish Messenger*, May 30th, 1862.
[2] Hannah Adams, History of the Jews. [3] Tovey, Anglia Judaica.
[4] Ib. [5] See *Jewish Messenger* of 1861. [6] See Orient of 1841.

re-admission because of their commercial activity which promotes English trade, said it was "certain that none but kings and princes and their favorites ever gained by the Jews. They do boldly presume to engross the principal part of our trade now . . . and have outdone our English merchants." And the opponents of the Naturalization Bill in 1753 argued in the same strain that, if they were admitted to the rank of citizens, they would engross the whole commerce of the kingdom.[1]

Neither of these anticipations, however, came to pass after their actual emancipation. Judaism did not become the established church of England, nor even shake the pillars of the present one, and the few Jewish establishments in English cities by no means drove the merchants of the Christian creed to poverty. The number of the English Jews, about 18,000 up to 1841, was altogether too insignificant to incite any grounded fear of their overwhelming influence in matters of religion, politics, and trade. Their small number was the cause rather of their just claims being so long disregarded. Had they been as numerous as the Catholics or the Dissenters, they would have won their rights at a much earlier period. The government could not have ignored the threatening power of millions of oppressed people without apprehending serious injury to the crown and constitution. The comparatively few Jews, however, could exercise no mighty pressure upon the ruling power, therefore their full political equality was deferred from one decade to the other.

The noble courage of the great Macaulay, of Lord John Russell, and some other unbiased champions of humanity, was required to remove one disability of the Jews after the other. When it was argued against them, that they are more attached to their nation than they are to the people of

[1] Hannah Adams, ib.

England, Macaulay refuted this argument as unfair "till we have tried the experiment whether, by making Englishmen of them, they will not become members of the community."[1] When it was objected that the Jews look forward to the coming of a great deliverer and that, therefore, they could not heartily be attached to their present country, he rejoined: "Many Christians believe that Jesus will reign on earth during a thousand years; according to some the time is close at hand. Are we to exclude all millenarians from Parliament and office on the ground that they are impatiently looking forward to the miraculous monarchy which is to supersede the present dynasty and the present constitution of England?" *The truth is that bigotry will never want a pretence.*" He held further, "there is nothing in their national character which unfits them for the highest duties of citizens."[2]

Such cogent arguments, one should expect, must have stopped the cry of the fiercest opponents of the Jewish cause. It took, however, fully eight years more until their admission to civil and municipal offices became a law, April 1st, 1841. In that session of Parliament, Macaulay again defended their rights manfully, calling "on every gentleman who thought the Jews competent to discharge the duties of municipal officers to vote for this Bill."[3] His efforts were this time crowned with success. The majority of the members had "enlightened toleration" enough to vote in the affirmative.

The natural consequence was to relieve them from all civil disabilities whatever, permitting them even to enter Parliament. After seventeen years of additional struggle, they obtained also this privilege, in 1858.

---

[1] Speech in the House of Commons, April 5th, 1830.

[2] Speech on the Jewish Disabilities, April, 1833.

[3] Speech on the Jews' Declaration Bill, March 31st, 1841.

That year ended their practical persecution. For, as Macaulay properly said, "persecution it is to inflict any penalties on account of religious opinions." There is certainly no more humiliating penalty for a citizen than to be denied the right to hold office.

Now comes Professor Smith, after twenty years have passed since the English Jews were granted political power, and charges them with misdirecting it in conjuring up political danger to the country, and decries all of them as unpatriotic for the imaginary wrong of a few representatives! Now comes Professor Smith leading "that new-fangled class of our Liberals who ask themselves whether Jews can be patriots."[1] And now the Jews are "suddenly declared to be worthless strangers to the land—solely because many of them uphold the views which the best English statesmen of all parties had hitherto maintained."[2] Is this not cruel on his part? Is it not cruel to impugn the past patriotism of the English Jews, so often acknowledged by truthful Christians, because some of them hold diverse political views and advise diverse measures at a crisis in their common country? Though it cannot be disputed that they have "on several trying occasions laid on the altar of public safety noble sacrifices of their lives and their fortunes," and that "the blood of Israel profusely flowed in the fields of Waterloo,"[3] what matters it? "The Jew must be burned," as the Patriarch said to the Templar in Nathan the Wise, or at least branded with the suspicion of Jewish and plutopolitan motives in all his public actions.

The enemies of the Jews will never acquiesce in their liberties. They will continue to misjudge the Jews' relation to the community, and doubt their devotion to it. As one who was

[1] Westminster Review, July, 1878. [2] Ib.

[3] According to the above correspondent, *Jewish Messenger*.

unsuccessful in an enterprise, or defeated by a rival in a canvass, is apt to make his subordinates or even his family suffer for it by peevish conduct, so would they make the Jews suffer for every misfortune or defeat of the community. They do not shrink from charging upon them all the perils of a crisis into which it has fallen by a combination of causes imperceptible to the unreasoning brain of the masses; and how easily are these excited into the belief or pretext that the Jews, that peculiar people among us, the deadly enemies of Christ, have wrought all this mischief! This was, indeed, the practice in the Middle Ages, and it is so still. It was the outcry of many German literati raised against the Jews at the conclusion of the late Franco-Prussian war, in which thousands of Jews had nobly participated. Many of them had died a glorious soldier's death, in reward for which those favorites of the Muses sought to rouse and excite the common people against their Jewish compatriots.

Alas! reward for services rendered to the community was ever very miserly, or rather miserably, portioned out to the Jews. Those of Prussia had, in 1813, readily responded to the summons of the king. They strove to show their thankfulness for the gift bestowed on them a short time before. It was the edict of March 11th, 1812, declaring them as native citizens with equal rights and liberties, even the right to municipal offices, and to teach in public schools and universities, reserving only their admission to other public offices to after-legislation.

This was a rather fair precedent on the part of Frederick William. In return for it, the Jewish young men were among the first answering his appeal to come forth and defend the fatherland. Their service was gladly accepted, not the least objection being made on account of their religious creed.

How was it rewarded after the French conqueror was overthrown, and all dangers diverted? Not long after the splendid victories of the Allies, in 1814, the king retracted, first silently, then openly, the privileges granted the Jews in the period of distress and humiliation.

First it was decided that the edict of 1812 was not to apply to the reconquered or newly-won provinces. Again, the Jewish invalids, returning home from the battle-fields, where they had redeemed the Jewish honor with their blood, were denied any public employment,[1] in violation of the solemn pledge made before the war to the *whole* people that the government would provide suitable positions for the disabled soldiers. The Jews were henceforth excluded even from the office of surveyor and commissioner of auctions, under the pretext that these were state offices, the admission to which was in the edict left undecided.

The just hopes of the Jewish young men preparing for an academic career were cruelly betrayed. They could get no appointment as teachers and professors unless they submitted to baptism. An ordinance of 1822 repealed the respective franchise guaranteed to them in that edict, and so the fate of the ablest Jewish students was sealed. They were, in the whole Prussian monarchy, not even allowed to be druggists. In this way the king kept his promise! Such was the reward for their various sacrifices to the country.

In the provinces that were formerly under French rule, the Jews did not fare much better. Although an instruction was issued in 1830 that the condition of the Jews in the new and regained provinces should, until further action, remain as it was found on retaking possession of them by Prussia, they were nevertheless even there not allowed to hold office, serve as jurors, practice law, or be druggists.

[1] Ministerial decree of 1826.

Their liberties entering into the large kingdom of Westphalia with the French officials, in 1807, disappeared after the *glorious* year 1814.

So it was also at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. The Jews there, in an address published in 1832, complained as follows: "In the war called by them (the despots) the war of independence, we, too, have borne arms. Before that war, we of Frankfort, as everywhere else in Germany where the French law was ruling, enjoyed equal rights with our Christian fellow-citizens. When we returned from the battle-fields, however, we met our fathers and brothers, whom we had left as free citizens, again as serfs, and such we have been until to-day. They have assumed over us the right of the pest, viz., to diminish our population, as they do not let us contract more than fifteen marriages a year, though we number five thousand. They now advance against us that we came from the Orient and were strangers in the land, and that we considered even our Christian countrymen as such. However, this is our creed, this the doctrine inherited from our fathers: When God created the world, he created man and woman, not master and slave, Jews and Christians, rich and poor." Börne wrote in 1819, "After the overthrow of Napoleon, the Jewish liberties were here and there decried as pernicious to the state. The Jews were also suspected of being friendly to the French dominion. Their peculiarities were such that their haters would not tolerate them as citizens. Only Germans, such as, according to Tacitus, came forth from the woods with red hair and light-blue eyes, were in their opinion entitled to civil rights, whereas the dark-complexioned Jews contrasted too disagreeably with them."

This sarcastic utterance of his was the melancholy outcry of a member of the suffering race rather than a wanton reflection upon the ruling one. "He was born a slave,

therefore he loved freedom more than they," wrote he at a later period. He became indeed a sturdy and fervent apostle of freedom, in a country where despotism ruled supreme.

The oppressed Jews, it is true, could find some comfort in the similar sufferings of the entire German population; and to win their rights was to the Jews no more than the right to share in the endurance of wrongs. Their grievances, however, were increased by the popular hatred and contempt under which they were yet smarting.

The German Jews had to struggle long and hard till they obtained equal rights. Their participation in the wars of independence availed them nothing. Nor was their military service which followed, of any considerable benefit to them. The before-mentioned *Gazette* has put their number enlisted from 1814 to 1842, at 3,314. Notwithstanding this respectable showing for a still persecuted class, their advancement in military rank was a very rare occurrence.

The wild year of the revolution, 1848, brought them some relief. The Constituent Assembly at Berlin had declared all civil and political rights independent of any religious denomination, whereby the Jews also gained their liberties. These were even acknowledged by the constitution of 1850. But the subsequent reaction overturned this beneficial result; so they had to fight again for their rights. They did so persistently till at last, in 1869, the law of the North German Confederacy relieved them from the mediæval yoke they had so long borne. Their full political equality in all the confederate German states was now a sanctioned law, though by no means an accomplished fact. God knows when the time will come for that. The *Teutonic race* will not so soon cease their pandering to mediæval prejudices against the Jews.

The German Jews have since then, in the Franco-Prussian

war, evinced their love of country in an unexampled degree. Philippson, in his "Memoirs of that war for the German Israelites," states that in this national rising the Jews took an ample part. Besides the conscripts and regulars, there served in the united German forces a large number of them as volunteers. Among these, there were young men who had come from Holland and England, even from America and Cairo, to stand by their offended and imperilled fatherland. That indefatigable journalist and author collected a list of the Jewish-German soldiers participating in the campaign which resulted in showing their number at 2,531 men. Considering that this list was but the first of a series to be published after he would have received more complete reports, and that none at all were sent him from the largest Jewish communities, as Berlin, Breslau, Posen, Frankfort, no one, not even Professor Smith, will deny this to have been well proportioned to their relative number in the country. Cannot the Jews then be patriots?

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 019 565 362 8